



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/760,010	01/10/2001	Steven H. Bass	02-100620US	2748
22798	7590	10/22/2003	EXAMINER	
QUINE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, P.C. P O BOX 458 ALAMEDA, CA 94501			SIEW, JEFFREY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1637	
DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/760,010	BASS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jeffrey Siew	1637	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 300-427 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 300-427 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:  
         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
     \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

**THE FOLLOWING IS A NEW GROUND OF REJECTION NECESSITATED BY THE AMENDMENT**

1. Claims 300-320 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pattern et al (US6,406,910 June 18, 2002) in view of Iverson et al (US6,180,341 Jan. 30, 2001).

Pattern et al teach shuffling in in vitro evolution and in vitro transcription and translation (see whole document esp. abstract, col. 18 lines 12-22, col. 21 lines 40-65, col. 34 lines 22-25). They also teach incubators, robotic systems (see col. 32 lines 19-65). They teach sequencing programs and computers, and optical storage devices for interfacing with assay (see col. 33 lines 1-50). They teach protein purification techniques (see col. 19 line 62 –col.20 line 20).

Pattern et al do not teach in vitro mutagenesis reactions in a physical array.

Iverson et al teach in vitro mutagenesis in physical array of microtiter for robotic throughput.(see col. 19 lines 59-67).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply Iverson et al's in vitro transcription in microtiter format to Pattern et al's system in order to increase analytical throughput. Iverson et al states that microtiter format coupled with robotics leads to 100 fold reduction in time and effort. It would have been prima facie obvious to apply Iverson et al's microtiter format to Pattern et al's system in order to increase the number of sample analysis in in vitro evolution.

The term system reads broadly and cover the set steps in series of procedures involving different machines and lab instruments. Moreover one of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated apply Iverson et al's microtiter arrays to automate the robotic systems to expedite the in vitro transcription and translation procedure of Pattern.

2. Claim 321-327 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pattern et al (US6,406,910 June 18, 2002) in view of Iverson et al (US6,180,341 Jan. 30, 2001) in further view of Nova et al (US6,284,459 Sept 4, 2001).

The teachings and suggestions of Pattern et al and Iverson et al are described previously.

Nova et al teach bar code (col. 7 lines 51-65).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply bar codes to combined invention of Pattern et al and Iverson et al in order to maintain the identity and content information. Bar codes were well known and commonly used to store information on products and quick retrieval. It would have been prima facie obvious to apply Nova et al's teaching of bar codes on arrays to Pattern et al's reaction plates in order to permanently scribe information on the plate for later quick retrieval.

## SUMMARY

3. No claims allowed.

***Conclusion***

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Siew whose telephone number is (703) 305-3886 and whose e-mail address is Jeffrey.Siew@uspto.gov. However, the office cannot guarantee security through the e-mail system nor should official papers be transmitted through this route. The examiner is on flex-time schedule and can best be reached on weekdays from 6:30 a.m. to 3 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion, can be reached on (703)-308-1119.

Any inquiry of a general nature, matching or filed papers or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tracey Johnson for Art Unit 1637 whose telephone number is (703)-305-2982.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CM1 Center numbers for Group 1600 are Voice (703) 308-3290 and FAX (703)-308-4242.

  
**JEFFREY SIEW**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

October 20, 2003